

REMARKS

Revised drawing sheets, per the requirement of the Examiner, are included herein.

The art rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites that the control device comprises detector means for discriminating between a transmitting state and receiving state of the communication device. Based on such states, various non-uniform selection patterns are effected from among possible antenna directivity configurations.

The Examiner cites the Kurby reference as allegedly showing discriminating between a transmitting state and receiving state and selecting antenna directivity configurations based on this detected state. Applicants have read the portions of Kurby designated by the Examiner, namely column 5, line 31 through column 6, line 35. Applicants are not finding what the Examiner says is there. As far as Applicants can tell, it appears that Kurby's antenna is steering based on received signal quality, not based on detection of the receive or transmit state of the device. Where does the Examiner precisely see that steering would be based on detection of receive/transmit state?

Bradley seems to be similarly defective this regard.

The two references being apparently similarly defective, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 1.

The original dependent claims recite further patentable distinctions over the references. For instance, claim 4 recites that the non-uniform preferences are subject to overruling by a user person. Against this recitation, the Examiner cites column 5 lines 1-9 of Kurby. Applicants have read these lines, and see that patterns are chosen, but do not see any text indicating that a

REMARKS

pattern is being chosen by a user. As far as Applicants can tell from the cited text, the patterns are chosen automatically by the device.

The new claims 13-15 have been added that more clearly distinguish over the directional patterns shown in Bradley. New claim 16 is a method claim of similar scope to claim 13. Claims 17 through 19 are dependent method claims.

The Examiner's other rejections or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the foregoing. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to respond to those rejections and arguments at a later date.

Applicants respectfully submit that they have answered each issue raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to	
Mail Stop _____ Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA 22313-1450	
On _____	(date)
By _____	(signature)

Respectfully submitted,

By *A E Barschall*
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719
August 4, 2003